

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 1 and 3 to 26 are pending in the present application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Allowed Claims 1, 3 to 8 and 11 to 26

Applicants note with appreciation the indication that claims 1, 3 to 8 and 11 to 26 are allowed.

III. Rejection of Claims 9 and 10 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,229,975 ("Truesdell et al."), U.S. Patent No. 4,614,945 ("Brunius et al."), U.S. Patent No. 5,424,726 ("Beymer") and U.S. Patent No. 5,761,155 ("Eccardt et al."). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Truesdell et al., Brunius et al., Beymer and Eccardt et al. does not render unpatentable the present claims as amended herein for at least the following reasons.

Claim 9 relates to a device for detecting objects. Claim 9 has been amended herein without prejudice to recite that a microcontroller of the device is configured to apply to a transmitting signal an identifier signal that is changeable with time. Support for this amendment may be found, for example, on page 4, lines 14 to 17 of the Specification. As set forth, for example, in the Amendment filed on February 3, 2005, the combination of Truesdell et al., Brunius et al. and Beymer does not disclose, or even suggest, an identifier signal that is **changeable with time** being applied to a transmitting signal. Eccardt et al. are not relied upon for disclosing or suggesting an identifier that is changeable with time being applied to a transmitting signal. Rather, Eccardt et al. are only relied upon for allegedly disclosing a foil transducer. It is respectfully submitted that Eccardt et al. do not disclose, or even suggest, an identifier signal that is changeable with time being applied to a transmitting signal. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Truesdell et al., Brunius et al., Beymer and Eccardt et al. does not render unpatentable amended claim 9.

As for claim 10, which depends from claim 9 and therefore includes all of the features of claim 9, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Truesdell et al., Brunius et al., Beymer and Eccardt et al. does not render unpatentable dependent claim 10 for at least the same reasons more fully set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 9.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

Date: July 28, 2005 By:

Richard L. Mayer
Reg. No. 22,490
No 42,194

One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-5288
CUSTOMER NO. 26646